

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending. Claims 11 and 17 have been amended for clarification purposes only. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bridges, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0186695.

For a claim to be anticipated, each and every non-inherent claim limitation must be disclosed in a reference. MPEP 2131.

Claim 1 recites “A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising storing a SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station; **identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic**; storing the identified plurality of SIDs in a memory that is accessible by a mobile station; comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of SIDs; and **upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.**”

Claim 17 recites “A mobile station, comprising a controller; a wireless transceiver; and at least one memory, the at least one memory comprising a location for storing a Home SID and other locations for storing a plurality of Cousin SIDs, **wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be a Home service provider if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of stored Cousin SIDs.**”

The Patent Office asserted (pages 2-3, of the non-final Office Action mailed February 22, 2006) “Regarding claim 1, Bridges discloses a method of operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SI) parameters to mobile stations, comprising: storing a SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station (page 2[0013]); identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic (page 3 [0026]), common spatial characteristic read on “roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology”); storing the identified plurality of SIDs in a memory that is accessible by a mobile station (page 3 [0028]); comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the stored

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

plurality of SIDs (page 2[0014]); and upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station (page 2 [0014]) and page 7 [0060]).”

“Regarding claim 17, Bridges further discloses a mobile station, comprising: a controller (page 17 claim 1); a wireless transceiver (page 1 [0008]); and at least one memory, the at least one memory comprising a location for storing a Home SID and other locations for storing a plurality of cousin SIDs (page 3 [0028], Cousin SIDs read on “wireless carrier identities”), wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be associated with a Home service provider if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of stored Cousin SIDs (page 2 [0014]).”

Bridges discloses (paragraph 0014) “If the SIDs do not match, then the mobile station is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider.” Bridges discloses (paragraph 0022) “The generator generates a list of the preferred wireless carrier identities based upon a selected class of service and the home market area of the mobile station,” (paragraph 0023) “the database further comprises a plurality of predetermined home market areas, and the generated list of preferred wireless carrier identities is based upon the selected class of service and a selected one of the plurality of home market areas,” (paragraph 0027) “The list of preferred wireless carrier identities comprises a plurality of entries indicating a system identification number (and/or System Operator Code) and a corresponding frequency band for each preferred wireless carrier,” (paragraph 0028) “The selector automatically selects a preferred wireless carrier from the list stored in the memory when the mobile station is roaming and enters one of the market areas of the plurality of market areas,” and (paragraph 0026) “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology provided for each of the plurality of market areas.”

Contrary to the Patent Office’s assertions, Bridges does not disclose **“identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic”** nor **upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”** The Patent Office asserted that Bridges

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

discloses identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic (page 3 [0026]). Bridges discloses (paragraph 0026) “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers' roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology.” Airtime rates is an economic characteristic; services relate to functional or feature characteristics; and air interface technology refers to technical characteristics. None of airtime rates, services or air interface technology relate to “a common spatial characteristic,” as found in claim 1. The Patent Office also asserted that Bridges (page 2 [0014] and page 7 [0060]) discloses “upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station” and “wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be a Home service provider if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of stored Cousin SIDs (page 2 [0014]).”

Bridges (paragraph 0014) discloses “The SID or equivalent system identification number is broadcast by each wireless carrier and is used by the mobile station to determine whether or not the mobile station is operating in its home network or if it is operating in a roaming condition. The mobile station makes this determination by reading the SID broadcast in the cellular market area where it is located, and comparing it to the home SID stored in the NAM of the cellular phone unit. If the SIDs do not match, then the mobile station is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider. Due to the imposition of a fixed surcharge or higher per unit rate, the airtime charges when the mobile station is roaming are customarily higher than when it is operating within its home network.”

Bridges (paragraph 0060) discloses “At step S.6, the mobile station determines whether it is in its home system or market area. Whether or not the mobile station is located in its home market area may be determined by analyzing the SID, SOC or equivalent system identification number of the cellular service provider for the area in which the mobile station is located. By comparing the SID or SOC received on the control channel with the home SID or SOC of the home service provider, the mobile station may determine whether it is located in its home system. As described above, the home SID or SOC may be stored in the NAM of the mobile station, or may be stored in another appropriate memory or storage device of the mobile station. For example, the home SID or SOC may be stored separately from the PSL/IRDB of the mobile

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

station, or may be stored in memory 67 as part of the PSL/IRDB.”

Neither paragraph 0014 nor paragraph 0060 of Bridges disclose that upon matching the received SID with any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, then “declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”

Thus, Bridges does not anticipate claim 1 or claim 17.

The Patent Office rejected claims 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges in view of McGregor, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2001/0000777.

Claim 4 recites “A method as in claim 1, wherein the steps of identifying, storing, comparing and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation.”

The Patent Office asserted, in pertinent part, (page 5 of the non-final Office Action mailed February 22, 2006) “Bridges differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching for the steps of identifying, storing, comparing and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation. However, McGregor teaches the steps of identifying, storing, comparing and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation (col. 8 lines 53-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bridges for the steps of identifying, storing, comparing and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation as per teaching of McGregor, because it provide the mobile phone unit having an internal processor with accessible internal memory for storing the accounting program and call data for each call.”

Contrary to the Patent Office’s assertions, as to claim 4 (which incorporates the subject matter of base claim 1), Bridges does not disclose “**identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic**” nor **upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.**” The Patent Office asserted that Bridges discloses identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic (page 3 [0026]). Bridges discloses (paragraph 0013). Bridges discloses “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

based upon the plurality of wireless carriers' roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology." Airtime rates is an economic characteristic; services relate to functional or feature characteristics; and air interface technology refers to a technical characteristics. None of airtime rates, services or air interface technology relate to "a common spatial characteristic," as found in claim 1. The Patent Office also asserted that Bridges (page 2 [0014] and page 7 [0060]) discloses "upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station" and "wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be a Home service provider if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of stored Cousin SIDs (page 2 [0014])."

Bridges (paragraph 0014) discloses "The SID or equivalent system identification number is broadcast by each wireless carrier and is used by the mobile station to determine whether or not the mobile station is operating in its home network or if it is operating in a roaming condition. The mobile station makes this determination by reading the SID broadcast in the cellular market area where it is located, and comparing it to the home SID stored in the NAM of the cellular phone unit. If the SIDs do not match, then the mobile station is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider. Due to the imposition of a fixed surcharge or higher per unit rate, the airtime charges when the mobile station is roaming are customarily higher than when it is operating within its home network."

Bridges (paragraph 0060) discloses "At step S.6, the mobile station determines whether it is in its home system or market area. Whether or not the mobile station is located in its home market area may be determined by analyzing the SID, SOC or equivalent system identification number of the cellular service provider for the area in which the mobile station is located. By comparing the SID or SOC received on the control channel with the home SID or SOC of the home service provider, the mobile station may determine whether it is located in its home system. As described above, the home SID or SOC may be stored in the NAM of the mobile station, or may be stored in another appropriate memory or storage device of the mobile station. For example, the home SID or SOC may be stored separately from the PSL/IRDB of the mobile station, or may be stored in memory 67 as part of the PSL/IRDB."

Neither paragraph 0014 nor paragraph 0060 of Bridges disclose that upon matching the

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

received SID with any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, then “declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”

McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic” nor upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.**” Thus, claim 4 is allowable over the prior art of record.

McGregor discloses a debit mode (paragraph 0223) and a no_debit mode (paragraph 0228) but does not seem to interrelate these to any steps of identifying a plurality of SIDs, storing the identified plurality of SIDs, comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of SIDs; and upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station.

Furthermore, as to claim 4, where is the alleged teaching in McGregor for “identifying, storing, comparing and declaring...” The Patent Office’s reference to page 8, lines 53-55, are confusing. Did the Patent Office intend to recite paragraph 0244’s “Each phone unit may be polled and updated by the system provider during off-hours. Preferably, the updated rate table is coded when the user applies for an increase in the internal phone account.” This passage of McGregor does not disclose or fairly suggest claim 4’s limitation of “wherein the steps of identifying, storing, comparing and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation.” Thus, claims 4 is allowable over the prior art of record for this additional reason.

Claims 7 and 9 were also rejected by Bridges in view of McGregor. Claims 7 and 9 depend from claim 1. No motivational statement has been provided for modifying Bridges by McGregor in making obviousness rejections of these two claims. At the least, claims 7 and 9 are allowable because they depend from allowable base claim 1.

Claim 10 recites “A wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

a prepaid service provider at least one memory storing a SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic**, the mobile station comprising a processor that is coupled to the at least one memory and that is responsive to a received SID for comparing the received SID to the SIDs in the list of SIDs and, **upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the mobile station.**”

The Patent Office asserted, in pertinent part, (page 6, of the non-final Office Action mailed February 22, 2006) “Regarding claim 10, ... Bridges differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching for a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider. However, McGregor teaches for a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider (page 12 claim 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bridges for a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider as per teaching of McGregor, because it provide the mobile phone unit having an internal processor with accessible internal memory for storing the accounting program and call data for each call.”

Bridges, as discussed above, regarding claims 1 and 17, does not disclose (or fairly suggest) “A wireless communication system ... comprising ... at least one memory storing a SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic**, ... **upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the mobile station.**” McGregor discloses a mobile phone with internal accounting for real time call debiting to account for the billing parameters of a mobile phone unit that is operated in a multi zone communication network with a complex rate structure (abstract). McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

disclose or fairly suggest “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic**” nor “**upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the mobile station.**” Thus, claim 10 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 12 and 15 are allowable because they depend from allowable base claim 10. Furthermore, as to claim 15, although McGregor’s claim 25 recites “a representation of prepaid funds,” McGregor does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest displaying a message to a user for informing the user that the user is operating in a Prepaid mode.

Claim 18 depends from claim 17 which was rejected as being anticipated by Bridges. No motivational statement has been provided for modifying Bridges by McGregor in rejecting claim 18. Applicant believes that claim 18 is allowable for reasons similar to the allowability of claims 1, 10, and 17.

Claim 20 recites “A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to prepaid mobile stations, comprising storing, in at least one memory that is accessible by a mobile station, a first SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a plurality of second SIDs; comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the first SID and **upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station**; and **if the received SID does not match the first SID, comparing the received SID to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.**”

Bridges, as discussed above, regarding claims 1 and 17, does not disclose (or fairly suggest) “**upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station**; and **if the received SID does not match the first SID, comparing the received SID to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the**

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

mobile station.” McGregor discloses a mobile phone with internal accounting for real time call debiting to account for the billing parameters of a mobile phone unit that is operated in a multi zone communication network with a complex rate structure (abstract). McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station”** or **“if the received SID does not match the first SID, comparing the received SID to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”** Thus, claim 20 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 22 recites **“A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to prepaid mobile stations, comprising storing, in at least one memory that is accessible by a mobile station, a first SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a plurality of second SIDs; comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and if the received SID does not match any one of the plurality of second SIDs, comparing the received SID to the first SID and upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”**

Bridges, as discussed above, regarding claims 1 and 17, does not disclose (or fairly suggest) **“comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and if the received SID does not match any one of the plurality of second SIDs, comparing the received SID to the first SID and upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”** McGregor discloses a mobile phone with internal accounting for real

time call debiting to account for the billing parameters of a mobile phone unit that is operated in a multi zone communication network with a complex rate structure (abstract). McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station”** or **“if the received SID does not match any one of the plurality of second SIDs, comparing the received SID to the first SID and upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”** Thus, claim 22 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 24 recites **“A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) and System Operator Code (SOC) parameters to prepaid mobile stations, comprising storing, in at least one memory that is accessible by a mobile station, a SOC that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a plurality of SIDs; comparing a SOC received from a wireless service provider to the stored SOC and upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and if the received SOC does not match the stored SOC, comparing a related received SID to the plurality of stored SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”**

Bridges, as discussed above, regarding claims 1 and 17, does not disclose (or fairly suggest) **“upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station”** or **“if the received SOC does not match the stored SOC, comparing a related received SID to the plurality of stored SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”** Furthermore, Bridges does not disclose or fairly suggest the two stage process of first checking for a matched SOC and, then, failing a match, checking for a matched SID. McGregor discloses a mobile phone with internal accounting for real time call debiting to

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

account for the billing parameters of a mobile phone unit that is operated in a multi zone communication network with a complex rate structure (abstract). McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station”** or **“if the received SOC does not match the stored SOC, comparing a related received SID to the plurality of stored SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”** Thus, claim 24 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 26 recites **“A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) and System Operator Code (SOC) parameters to prepaid mobile stations, comprising storing, in at least one memory that is accessible by a mobile station, a SOC that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a plurality of SIDs; comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the plurality of stored SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and if the received SID does not match any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, comparing a received SOC to the stored SOC and upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”**

Bridges, as discussed above, regarding claims 1 and 17, does not disclose (or fairly suggest) **“upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station”** or **“if the received SID does not match any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, comparing a received SOC to the stored SOC and upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”** Furthermore, Bridges does not disclose or fairly suggest the two stage process of first checking for a matched SID and, then, failing a match, checking for a matched SOC. McGregor discloses a mobile phone with internal accounting for real time call debiting to

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

account for the billing parameters of a mobile phone unit that is operated in a multi zone communication network with a complex rate structure (abstract). McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station”** or **“if the received SID does not match any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, comparing a received SOC to the stored SOC and upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”** Thus, claim 26 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 28 recites “A system as in claim 10, wherein the at least one memory is removable from the mobile station.”

Bridges discloses (paragraph 0046) “According to an aspect of the present invention, a Preferred System Identification List (PSL) (for cellular systems) and/or an Intelligent Roaming Database Downloading (IRDB) (for cellular, PCS and other wireless systems) is stored within a memory or storage device of the mobile station. When the mobile station is roaming, the PSL or IRDB is accessed to indicate the band where the mobile station will find a preferred system. If the mobile station is capable of operating in either a cellular or PCS system, the mobile station may access the PSL or IRDB depending on the type of system that it is located in or its current operating mode. The present invention, however, is not limited to cellular or PCS networks, and may be used with other wireless networks and environments, such as Wireless Communication Services (WCS), Enhanced Specialized Mobile Radio (ESMR), iDENS, and repropose channels 60-69. The invention, therefore, may provide intelligent roaming capabilities across single and multiple hyperbands and is not limited to cellular and PCS systems. Further, the preferred system will be a system which supports the service requirements of a particular subscriber. The preferred system may also satisfy the preferences of a particular National Account reflecting preferred rates negotiated for that National Account in the market area that the mobile station is roaming in. Further, it is possible that the preferred system be defined and/or selected according to a required or preferred air-interface technology (e.g., TDMA, CDMA, PACS, GSM and PCS-1900) to be utilized by the mobile station.”

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

Bridges does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest “wherein the at least one memory is removable from the mobile station.”

Thus, claim 28 is allowable over the prior art of record for this additional reason.

The Patent Office rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges in view of Mizikovsky, U.S. Patent No. 5,983,115.

Claim 2 recites “A method as in claim 1, wherein the common spatial characteristic is comprised of a geographical area that corresponds to a postal zone.”

Claim 3 recites “A method as in claim 1, wherein the common spatial characteristic is comprised of a geographical area that corresponds to a ZIP code.”

Bridges discloses (paragraph 0014) “If the SIDs do not match, then the mobile station is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider.” Bridges discloses (paragraph 0022) “The generator generates a list of the preferred wireless carrier identities based upon a selected class of service and the home market area of the mobile station,” (paragraph 0023) “the database further comprises a plurality of predetermined home market areas, and the generated list of preferred wireless carrier identities is based upon the selected class of service and a selected one of the plurality of home market areas,” (paragraph 0027) “The list of preferred wireless carrier identities comprises a plurality of entries indicating a system identification number (and/or System Operator Code) and a corresponding frequency band for each preferred wireless carrier,” (paragraph 0028) “The selector automatically selects a preferred wireless carrier from the list stored in the memory when the mobile station is roaming and enters one of the market areas of the plurality of market areas,” and (paragraph 0026) “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology provided for each of the plurality of market areas.”

Contrary to the Patent Office’s assertions, Bridges does not disclose “**identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic**” nor **upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a**

Home service provider for the mobile station.” The Patent Office asserted that Bridges discloses identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic (page 3 [0026]). Bridges discloses (paragraph 0013). Bridges discloses “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers' roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology.” Airtime rates is an economic characteristic; services relate to functional or feature characteristics; and air interface technology refers to a technical characteristics. None of airtime rates, services or air interface technology relate to “a common spatial characteristic,” as found in claim 1. The Patent Office also asserted that Bridges (page 2 [0014] and page 7 [0060]) discloses “upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station” and “wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be a Home service provider if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of stored Cousin SIDs (page 2 [0014]).”

Bridges (paragraph 0014) discloses “The SID or equivalent system identification number is broadcast by each wireless carrier and is used by the mobile station to determine whether or not the mobile station is operating in its home network or if it is operating in a roaming condition. The mobile station makes this determination by reading the SID broadcast in the cellular market area where it is located, and comparing it to the home SID stored in the NAM of the cellular phone unit. If the SIDs do not match, then the mobile station is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider. Due to the imposition of a fixed surcharge or higher per unit rate, the airtime charges when the mobile station is roaming are customarily higher than when it is operating within its home network.”

Bridges (paragraph 0060) discloses “At step S.6, the mobile station determines whether it is in its home system or market area. Whether or not the mobile station is located in its home market area may be determined by analyzing the SID, SOC or equivalent system identification number of the cellular service provider for the area in which the mobile station is located. By comparing the SID or SOC received on the control channel with the home SID or SOC of the home service provider, the mobile station may determine whether it is located in its home system. As described above, the home SID or SOC may be stored in the NAM of the mobile station, or may be stored in another appropriate memory or storage device of the mobile station. For

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

example, the home SID or SOC may be stored separately from the PSL/IRDB of the mobile station, or may be stored in memory 67 as part of the PSL/IRDB.”

Neither paragraph 0014 nor paragraph 0060 of Bridges disclose that upon matching the received SID with any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, then “declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”

Mizikovsky discloses (abstract) a communication device that locates a wireless service provider in a multi-service provider environment using a stored list of preferred service providers, the list has a plurality of uniquely identified sublists, each sublist is associated with a different geographic area and identifies a more preferred service provider and a less preferred service provider. Mizikovsky discloses (col. 8, lines 36-41) the mobile communication device registers with the best stored SOC or SID, that is, an SOC or SID that has at least been associated with a preferred service provider in which the best service provider is identified by comparing the stored SOC or SIDs with the list of preferred SOC or SIDs. Mizikovsky seeks to determine if a received SID or SOC is an optimal, preferred, or prohibited service provider (col. 5, lines 57-67) and does not appear to disclose or suggest assigning a home service provider (e.g., col. 3, lines 10-18). The claimed invention in claim 1, 2, and 3, recites that if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station. Mizikovsky, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter of **“identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic”** nor **“upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”**

Thus, claims 2 and 3 are not made obvious by a combination of Bridges and Mizikovsky.

Furthermore, since Bridges only appears to disclose “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers' roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology,” Bridges is seemingly unconcerned with **“identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic,”** as recited in claim 1, Bridges does not appear to be amenable to modification to identify a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic.

The Patent Office rejected claims 5, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

unpatentable over Bridges, in view of Bamburak.

Claim 5 recites “A method as in claim 1, wherein if none of the plurality of stored SIDs matches the received SID, further comprising comparing the received SID to other stored SIDs, including at least one of a Partner SID, a Favored SID and a Forbidden SID.”

Claim 6 recites “A method as in claim 1, wherein if none of the plurality of stored SIDs matches the received SID, further comprising comparing a received System Operator Code (SOC) to stored SOC, including at least one of a Partner SOC, a Favored SOC and a Forbidden SOC.”

Claim 8 recites “A method as in claim 1, wherein the step of comparing includes a preliminary step of comparing the received SID to the stored SID that identifies the Home service provider for the mobile station, and upon a match declaring the service provider to be the Home service provider, and inhibiting the execution of the step of comparing the SID received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of SIDs.”

Bridges discloses (paragraph 0014) “If the SIDs do not match, then the mobile station is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider.” Bridges discloses (paragraph 0022) “The generator generates a list of the preferred wireless carrier identities based upon a selected class of service and the home market area of the mobile station,” (paragraph 0023) “the database further comprises a plurality of predetermined home market areas, and the generated list of preferred wireless carrier identities is based upon the selected class of service and a selected one of the plurality of home market areas,” (paragraph 0027) “The list of preferred wireless carrier identities comprises a plurality of entries indicating a system identification number (and/or System Operator Code) and a corresponding frequency band for each preferred wireless carrier,” (paragraph 0028) “The selector automatically selects a preferred wireless carrier from the list stored in the memory when the mobile station is roaming and enters one of the market areas of the plurality of market areas,” and (paragraph 0026) “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology provided for each of the plurality of market areas.”

Contrary to the Patent Office's assertions, Bridges does not disclose **"identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic" nor upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.**" The Patent Office asserted that Bridges discloses identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic (page 3 [0026]). Bridges discloses (paragraph 0013). Bridges discloses "the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers' roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology." Airtime rates is an economic characteristic; services relate to functional or feature characteristics; and air interface technology refers to a technical characteristics. None of airtime rates, services or air interface technology relate to "a common spatial characteristic," as found in claim 1. The Patent Office also asserted that Bridges (page 2 [0014] and page 7 [0060]) discloses "upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station" and "wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be a Home service provider if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of stored Cousin SIDs (page 2 [0014])."

Bridges (paragraph 0014) discloses "The SID or equivalent system identification number is broadcast by each wireless carrier and is used by the mobile station to determine whether or not the mobile station is operating in its home network or if it is operating in a roaming condition. The mobile station makes this determination by reading the SID broadcast in the cellular market area where it is located, and comparing it to the home SID stored in the NAM of the cellular phone unit. If the SIDs do not match, then the mobile station is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider. Due to the imposition of a fixed surcharge or higher per unit rate, the airtime charges when the mobile station is roaming are customarily higher than when it is operating within its home network."

Bridges (paragraph 0060) discloses "At step S.6, the mobile station determines whether it is in its home system or market area. Whether or not the mobile station is located in its home market area may be determined by analyzing the SID, SOC or equivalent system identification number of the cellular service provider for the area in which the mobile station is located. By comparing the SID or SOC received on the control channel with the home SID or SOC of the

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

home service provider, the mobile station may determine whether it is located in its home system. As described above, the home SID or SOC may be stored in the NAM of the mobile station, or may be stored in another appropriate memory or storage device of the mobile station. For example, the home SID or SOC may be stored separately from the PSL/IRDB of the mobile station, or may be stored in memory 67 as part of the PSL/IRDB.”

Neither paragraph 0014 nor paragraph 0060 of Bridges disclose that upon matching the received SID with any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, then “declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”

Bamburak appears to be directed to finding an optimal service provider and not a home service provider (col. 3, lines 49-52). In Bamburak, the SOC or SID of a service provider is checked to determine if the SOC or SID corresponds to an optimal service provider (col. 5, lines 25-28) via a list of a optimal SOC or SIDs (col. 6, lines 28-30). The claimed invention in claims 1, 17, and 22, recites that if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station. Like Bridges (or McGregor), Bamburak does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter. Bamburak, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter of **“identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic”** nor **“upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”**

Thus, claims 5, 6, and 8 are not made obvious by a combination of Bridges and Bamburak.

Furthermore, since Bridges only appears to disclose “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers' roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology,” Bridges is seemingly unconcerned with **“identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic,”** as recited in claim 1, Bridges does not appear to be amenable to modification to identify a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic.

Thus, claims 5, 6, and 8 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

Bridges, in view of McGregor, as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Mizikovsky.

The Patent Office asserted, in pertinent part, (page 6, of the non-final Office Action mailed February 22, 2006) “Regarding claim 10, ... Bridges differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching for a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider. However, McGregor teaches for a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider (page 12 claim 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bridges for a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider as per teaching of McGregor, because it provide the mobile phone unit having an internal processor with accessible internal memory for storing the accounting program and call data for each call.”

Bridges, as discussed above, regarding claims 1 and 17, does not disclose (or fairly suggest) “A wireless communication system ... comprising ... at least one memory storing a SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic, ... upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the mobile station.**” McGregor discloses a mobile phone with internal accounting for real time call debiting to account for the billing parameters of a mobile phone unit that is operated in a multi zone communication network with a complex rate structure (abstract). McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic**” nor “**upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the mobile station.**”

Mizikovsky discloses (abstract) a communication device that locates a wireless service provider in a multi-service provider environment using a stored list of preferred service

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

providers, the list has a plurality of uniquely identified sublists, each sublist is associated with a different geographic area and identifies a more preferred service provider and a less preferred service provider. Mizikovsky discloses (col. 8, lines 36-41) the mobile communication device registers with the best stored SOC or SID, that is, an SOC or SID that has at least been associated with a preferred service provider in which the best service provider is identified by comparing the stored SOC or SIDs with the list of preferred SOC or SIDs. Mizikovsky seeks to determine if a received SID or SOC is an optimal, preferred, or prohibited service provider (col. 5, lines 57-67) and does not appear to disclose or suggest assigning a home service provider (e.g., col. 3, lines 10-18). The claimed invention in claim 1, 2, and 3, recites that if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station. Mizikovsky, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter of “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic**” nor “**upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the mobile station.**”

Thus, claim 11 is not made obvious by a combination of Bridges and Mizikovsky.

Furthermore, since Bridges only appears to disclose “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers' roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology,” Bridges is seemingly unconcerned with “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic**,” as recited in claim 10 (the base claim of claim 11), Bridges does not appear to be amenable to modification to identify a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic.

The Patent Office rejected claims 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 23, 25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges, in view of McGregor, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Bamburak.

Claim 13 recites “A system as in claim 10, wherein if none of the plurality of other SIDs matches the received SID, the processor compares the received SID to other stored SIDs found in an Intelligent Roaming Data Base (IRDB).”

Claim 14 recites “A system as in claim 10, wherein if none of the plurality of other SIDs

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

matches the received SID, the processor compares a received System Operator Code (SOC) to stored SOC's found in an Intelligent Roaming Data Base (IRDB)."

Claim 16 recites "A system as in claim 10, wherein the processor first compares the received SID to the stored SID that identifies the Home service provider for the mobile station, and upon a match declares the service provider to be the Home service provider, and inhibits comparing the received SID the list of other SIDs."

The Patent Office asserted, in pertinent part, (page 6, of the non-final Office Action mailed February 22, 2006) "Regarding claim 10, ... Bridges differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching for a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider. However, McGregor teaches for a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider (page 12 claim 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bridges for a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider as per teaching of McGregor, because it provide the mobile phone unit having an internal processor with accessible internal memory for storing the accounting program and call data for each call."

Bridges, as discussed above, regarding claims 1 and 17, does not disclose (or fairly suggest) "A wireless communication system ... comprising ... at least one memory storing a SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic, ... upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the mobile station.**" McGregor discloses a mobile phone with internal accounting for real time call debiting to account for the billing parameters of a mobile phone unit that is operated in a multi zone communication network with a complex rate structure (abstract). McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

disclose or fairly suggest “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic**” nor “**upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the mobile station.**”

Bamburak appears to be directed to finding an optimal service provider and not a home service provider (col. 3, lines 49-52). In Bamburak, the SOC or SID of a service provider is checked to determine if the SOC or SID corresponds to an optimal service provider (col. 5, lines 25-28) via a list of a optimal SOC or SIDs (col. 6, lines 28-30). The claimed invention in claims 1, 17, and 22, recites that if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station. Bamburak, like Bridges and/or McGregor, does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter of “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs **having a common spatial characteristic**” nor “**upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the mobile station.**”

Claims 13 and 14 are allowable because they depend from allowable base claims and are allowable on their own merits. As to claim 13, Bamburak does not appear to disclose an Intelligent Roaming Data Base (or IRDB). As to claim 14, Bamburak does not disclose if none of the plurality of SIDs matches the received SID, the processor then compare a received SOC to the stored SOC.

Thus, claims 13, 14, and 16 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 19 recites “A mobile station as in claim 17, wherein the Cousin SIDs are stored in a memory that is detachable from said mobile station.”

Claim 17, the base claim of claim 19, recites “A mobile station, comprising a controller; a wireless transceiver; and at least one memory, the at least one memory comprising a location for storing a Home SID and other locations for storing a plurality of Cousin SIDs, **wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be a Home service provider if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of**

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

stored Cousin SIDs.”

Bamburak appears to be directed to finding an optimal service provider and not a home service provider (col. 3, lines 49-52). In Bamburak, the SOC or SID of a service provider is checked to determine if the SOC or SID corresponds to an optimal service provider (col. 5, lines 25-28) via a list of a optimal SOC or SIDs (col. 6, lines 28-30). The claimed invention in claims 1, 17, and 22, recites that if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station. Bamburak, like Bridges and/or McGregor, does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter of **“wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be a Home service provider if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of stored Cousin SIDs.”**

Thus, claim 19 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 21 recites “A method as in claim 20, wherein if the received SID does not match any of the second SIDs, comparing the received SID to SIDs stored in an intelligent roaming data base (IRDB).”

Bridges, as discussed above, regarding claims 1 and 17, does not disclose (or fairly suggest) **“upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and if the received SID does not match the first SID, comparing the received SID to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”** McGregor discloses a mobile phone with internal accounting for real time call debiting to account for the billing parameters of a mobile phone unit that is operated in a multi zone communication network with a complex rate structure (abstract). McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station”** or **“if the received SID does not match the first SID, comparing the received SID to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the**

plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”

Bamburak appears to be directed to finding an optimal service provider and not a home service provider (col. 3, lines 49-52). In Bamburak, the SOC or SID of a service provider is checked to determine if the SOC or SID corresponds to an optimal service provider (col. 5, lines 25-28) via a list of a optimal SOC or SIDs (col. 6, lines 28-30). The claimed invention in claims 1, 17, and 22, recites that if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station. Like Bridges (or McGregor), Bamburak does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter. Bamburak, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter of **“upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station”** or **“if the received SID does not match the first SID, comparing the received SID to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”**

Claim 23 recites “A method as in claim 22, wherein if the received SID does not match the first SID, comparing the received SID to SIDs stored in an intelligent roaming data base (IRDB).”

Claim 25 recites “A method as in claim 24, wherein if the received SID does not match any of the second SIDs, comparing the received SID or SOC to SIDs or SOC stored in an intelligent roaming data base (IRDB).”

Claim 27 recites “A method as in claim 26, wherein if the received SOC does not match the stored SOC, comparing the received SID or SOC to SIDs or SOC stored in an intelligent roaming data base (IRDB).”

Bridges, McGregor, and Bamburak have been discussed above. As discussed above, none of the cited references appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service**

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

provider for the mobile station; and if the received SOC does not match the stored SOC, comparing a related received SID to the plurality of stored SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”

Thus claim 23 is allowable over the prior art of record.

As discussed above, none of the cited references appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station” or “if the received SOC does not match the stored SOC, comparing a related received SID to the plurality of stored SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”**

Thus claim 25 is allowable over the prior art of record.

As discussed above, none of the cited references appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and if the received SID does not match any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, comparing a received SOC to the stored SOC and upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”**

Thus claim 27 is allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office rejected claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges, in view of McGregor, as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Osmani, U.S. Patent No. 5,815,807.

Claim 29 recites “A system as in claim 10, wherein the mobile station operates in a Postpaid mode.”

Claim 30 recites “A system as in claim 10, wherein the mobile station has both Postpaid and Prepaid modes.”

The Patent Office asserted, in pertinent part, (page 5 of the non-final Office Action mailed February 22, 2006) “Bridges differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching for the steps of identifying, storing, comparing and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation. However, McGregor teaches the steps of identifying, storing, comparing and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation (col. 8 lines 53-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bridges for the steps of identifying, storing, comparing and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation as per teaching of McGregor, because it provide the mobile phone unit having an internal processor with accessible internal memory for storing the accounting program and call data for each call.”

Contrary to the Patent Office’s assertions, as to claim 4 (which incorporates the limitations of base claim 1), Bridges does not disclose **“identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic”** nor **upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”** The Patent Office asserted that Bridges discloses identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic (page 3 [0026]). Bridges discloses (paragraph 0013). Bridges discloses “the generator generates the list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon the plurality of wireless carriers’ roaming airtime rates, services or air interface technology.” Airtime rates is an economic characteristic; services relate to functional or feature characteristics; and air interface technology refers to a technical characteristics. None of airtime rates, services or air interface technology relate to “a common spatial characteristic,” as found in claim 1. The Patent Office also asserted that Bridges (page 2 [0014] and page 7 [0060]) discloses “upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station” and “wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be a Home service provider if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of stored Cousin SIDs (page 2 [0014]).”

Bridges (paragraph 0014) discloses “The SID or equivalent system identification number is broadcast by each wireless carrier and is used by the mobile station to determine whether or not

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

the mobile station is operating in its home network or if it is operating in a roaming condition. The mobile station makes this determination by reading the SID broadcast in the cellular market area where it is located, and comparing it to the home SID stored in the NAM of the cellular phone unit. If the SIDs do not match, then the mobile station is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider. Due to the imposition of a fixed surcharge or higher per unit rate, the airtime charges when the mobile station is roaming are customarily higher than when it is operating within its home network.”

Bridges (paragraph 0060) discloses “At step S.6, the mobile station determines whether it is in its home system or market area. Whether or not the mobile station is located in its home market area may be determined by analyzing the SID, SOC or equivalent system identification number of the cellular service provider for the area in which the mobile station is located. By comparing the SID or SOC received on the control channel with the home SID or SOC of the home service provider, the mobile station may determine whether it is located in its home system. As described above, the home SID or SOC may be stored in the NAM of the mobile station, or may be stored in another appropriate memory or storage device of the mobile station. For example, the home SID or SOC may be stored separately from the PSL/IRDB of the mobile station, or may be stored in memory 67 as part of the PSL/IRDB.”

Neither paragraph 0014 nor paragraph 0060 of Bridges disclose that upon matching the received SID with any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, then “declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”

McGregor, like Bridges, does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest “**identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic**” nor **upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.**”

Osmani discloses (column 1, lines 42-49) “Billing services for radiotelephone subscriber units include prepaid short term billing structures such as calling cards and debit cards and postpaid periodic billing structures. Cellular communication systems are owned and operated for profit by communications companies who typically sell use of the system based on the amount of time spent by the user on the system and the distance involved between the communicating

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

locations. Users may lease or buy cellular phones in order to use them on the system.”

Osmani, like McGregor and Bridges, does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest **“identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic” nor upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.”**

Thus, claims 29 and 30 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Bridges or under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Bridges, McGregor, Mizikovsky, Bamburak, and/ or Osmani, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-30 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-30 is earnestly solicited.

S.N.: 09/965,784
Art Unit: 2643

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski

Walter J. Malinowski

May 11, 2006

Date

Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400, extension 19

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

5-11-06

Date

Ann Okrentowicz

Name of Person Making Deposit